

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
NORTHERN DIVISION

CHARLES HICKS, #246241,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	CASE NO. 2:07-CV-668-WHA
)	[WO]
)	
PRISON HEALTH SERVICES, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

RECOMMENDATION OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE

In this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action, Charles Hicks [“Hicks”], a state inmate and frequent litigant in this court, asserts that medical personnel denied him adequate treatment for a blockage in his left leg on July 12, 2007, during his incarceration at the Staton Correctional Facility. Hicks names the Staton Correctional Facility as a defendant in this cause of action.

Upon review of the complaint, the court concludes that dismissal of the Staton Correctional Facility as a defendant in this cause of action prior to service of process is appropriate under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).

DISCUSSION

A state prison facility is not a legal entity subject to suit or liability under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. *See Dean v. Barber*, 951 F.2d 1210, 1214 (11th Cir. 1992). In light of the foregoing, the court concludes that the plaintiff’s claim against the Staton Correctional Facility is due to be summarily dismissed. *Id.*

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, it is the RECOMMENDATION of the Magistrate Judge that:

1. The plaintiff's claim against the Staton Correctional Facility be dismissed prior to service of process pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).
2. This correctional facility be dismissed as a defendant in this cause of action.
3. This case, with respect to the plaintiff's claim against the remaining defendants, be referred back to the undersigned for appropriate proceedings.

It is further

ORDERED that on or before August 6, 2007 the parties may file objections to this Recommendation. Any objections filed must clearly identify the findings in the Magistrate Judge's Recommendation to which the party is objecting. Frivolous, conclusive or general objections will not be considered by the District Court. The parties are advised that this Recommendation is not a final order of the court and, therefore, it is not appealable.

Failure to file written objections to the proposed findings and advisements in the Magistrate Judge's Recommendation shall bar the party from a de novo determination by the District Court of issues covered in the Recommendation and shall bar the party from attacking on appeal factual findings in the Recommendation accepted or adopted by the District Court except upon grounds of plain error or manifest injustice. *Nettles v. Wainwright*, 677 F.2d 404 (5th Cir. 1982). *See Stein v. Reynolds Securities, Inc.*, 667 F.2d 33 (11th Cir. 1982). *See also Bonner v. City of Prichard*, 661 F.2d 1206 (11th Cir. 1981, *en*

banc), adopting as binding precedent all decisions of the former Fifth Circuit handed down prior to the close of business on September 30, 1981.

Done this 24th day of July, 2007.

/s/Charles S. Coody
CHARLES S. COODY
CHIEF UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE